

**From:** Scott  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/24/02 4:00pm  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I have been following the Anti-trust suits against the Microsoft Corporation fairly closely. Being an engineer for an Internet Service Provider, many of the issues this suit was intended to resolve are important to me and the work I do. This is true not only for my own work in the office, but for dealing with our customers as well.

It is the nature of Microsoft's products, all of them, that they will work only in conjunction with each other. Thus, if I, or one of my customers, has need of one of any non-Microsoft products, whether Operating System, Office Suite, or any other software product, we must, by Microsoft's very nature, make a much larger investment in hardware to allow for these incompatible products on an entirely different workstation. Thus, instead of having to purchase one workstation for my small, business, I will need to purchase two so that I can fulfill the needs of my business. All of these products are incompatible ONLY because of Microsoft's lack of openness in the programming needs to make them compatible. Even different Versions of the same product are incompatible! So, since, my customer has upgraded to a newer Microsoft product, I must do the very same, simply to be able to properly interact with that customer. But, since I did so, all of the rest of my customers are required to do so as well. Again, just so we can all properly communicate.

Making it possible for any one who chooses to do so, to create software that is compatible with the most used Operating System and Office suite in the world. Looking over the information available on the proposed settlement of the Anti-trust suit, this is one of the most glaring failures of the settlement, this is not possible. Though there are statements in the proposal that seem to make this possible, there are enormous loopholes in each one, and even contradictory statements to nearly every one.

The largest interconnected network of computers, commonly referred to as "The Internet" is also dependent upon Microsoft. This highlights the glaring issues of Security in the Microsoft Product Line. I have not run across or used any product developed by Microsoft that has not required a security "fix" within the first month, at the outside. Because I deal with the Internet and the people who use it on a daily basis, I am constantly evangelizing about the dangers of the Microsoft products. Now, not only must I assist our customers with their Internet connectivity, but I now have to be a Microsoft Security Expert so that I can keep my own network secure and safe. Would I, because of the liaison position of Microsoft when dealing with security issues, be able to charge back to Microsoft all of the costs associated with the time, effort, training, and materials involved in my support of their product? Because they choose not to?

The proposal simply changes "HOW" Microsoft must interact with others. Instead of acting in a self serving, threatening, monopolistic fashion that was not only illegal, but entirely unethical; Microsoft would be able to act in a self serving, threatening, monopolistic fashion sanctioned by the Federal Government. If the intent of those who brought and pursued the suit in the first place was to simply make it legal and easier for Microsoft to enforce and reinforce its monopolistic position, then this proposal would succeed admirably.

Thank you for allowing me to provide some input into this process.

W. Scott Page  
Sales Engineer  
Internet Service Provider  
Pennsylvania